DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 370 930 SP 035 276

AUTHOR Ferris, Charles H., Jr.
TITLE A Program for Building Trust between Teachers and Administrators To Enhance the Supervision/Evaluation Process.
PUB DATE 8 Apr 94
NOTE 41p.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Action Research; Administrator Attitudes; *Administrator Characteristics; *Administrator Evaluation; Behavior Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Improvement Programs; *Interprofessional Relationship; Leadership; Measurement Techniques; Program Development; Program Effectiveness; Program Implementation; Questionnaires; Staff Development; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Trust (Psychology)
IDENTIFIERS *Collaborative Research; *Harwich School District MA

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this action research study was twofold: first, to identify administrator behaviors which enhance or inhibit the development of trust between teachers and administrators; and, second, to improve trust through a collaborative administrator/teacher trust building program. The project involved the three schools (totalling seven administrators) of the Harwich (Massachusetts) school district. Faculty members first devised and completed a questionnaire for rating administrator behaviors that enhance or inhibit trust, then trust building plans were collectively developed and implemented over a 12-month period, and, finally, plan results were assessed through re-administration of the questionnaire. Findings indicated: that questionnaire development was the most revealing part of the process and resulted in the identification of 30 administrator behaviors either enhancing or inhibiting trust; that development of trust building plans provided an increased awareness of the importance of trust by all members of the staff; and that the comparison of questionnaire responses before and after project implementation showed that the level of trust between teachers and administrators can be enhanced by making improvement an explicit goal of both the organization and of administrators. The Trust Building Program agenda including introductory and implementation activities, the identified behaviors of administrators rating form, and objectives and activities of trust building plans are appended. (Author/LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 370 930

A Program for Building Trust Between Teachers and Administrators to Enhance the Supervision/Evaluation Process

by

Charles H. Ferris, Jr., Ed.D.
Superintendent of Schools
Harwich Public Schools
Harwich, Massachusetts 02645

Paper Presented at the Annual Conference of the
American Educational Research Association
New Orleans, Louisiana

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. H. Ferris Jr

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

April 8, 1994

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SB035276

Abstract

A Program for Building a Climate of Trust
Between Teachers and Administrators to Facilitate
the Supervision/Evaluation Process

This report describes a collaborative process for a school staff to deal explicitly with building trust between teachers and administrators. The results of a survey the author conducted in 1990 to ascertain why teachers had not selected an optional goal-setting mode of evaluation revealed a concern with the level of trust between teachers and administrators.

To deal with the problem of the level of trust the author conducted a study that involved (a) a staff development program to devise a questionnaire for rating administrator behaviors that enhance or inhibit trust, (b) development and implementation of trust building plans over a 12-month period, and (c) assessment of the results of the trust building plans through readministration of the questionnaire developed in step (a).

Development of the questionnaire was, in itself, the most revealing part of the process for it resulted in the identification of 30 administrator behaviors that can enhance or inhibit the development of trust. Development of trust building plans resulted in increased awareness of the importance of trust by all members of the staff. The comparison of questionnaire responses before and after project implementation showed that the level of trust between teachers and administrators can be improved by making improvement an explicit goal of the organization and of individual administrators.

In addition, during the 2 years of implementation of this project, the number of teachers participating in the goal-setting mode of evaluation increased.

Table of Contents

Page

Abstract ii
List of Tables iv

Objectives 1

Background/Setting 2

Methods and Techniques 3

1991-1992 School Year 3
Introductory Activities 3
Questionnaire Design 4
Administration of the Administrator Rating Form: December 1991 6
Results of Administrator Ratings: December 1991 6
Development of Trust Building Plans 7
Implementation of Trust Building Plans 11

1992-1993 School Year. 11
Administration of the Administrator Rating Forms: March 1993 12
Results of Administrator Ratings: March 1993. 12

Summary and Discussion 20

Implications and Recommendations 23

References 25

Appendixes 26

A. Trust Building Program 27

B. Administrator Rating Form 32

C. Trust Building Plans: Objectives and Activities 34

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

List of Tables

Table		Page
1.	Administrator Rating Form: Summary of Group Results (12/91)	8
2.	Administrator Rating Form: Summary of Individual Results (12/91)	9
3.	Administrator Rating Form: Summary of Group Results (3/93)	14
4.	Administrator Rating Form: Summary of Group Results (12/91): Without Administrator D	15
5.	Administrative Team Results: Comparisons	16
6.	Administrator Rating Form: Summary of Individual Results (3/93)	20

A Program for Building Trust between Teachers and Administrators to Enhance the Supervision/Evaluation Process

Objectives

To identify administrator behaviors which enhance or inhibit the development of trust between teachers and administrators.

To improve trust through an administrator-teacher participatory trust building program.

Theoretical framework

The results of a questionnaire the author administered in 1990 to ascertain why teachers had not selected an optional goal-setting mode of evaluation revealed a concern with the level of trust between teachers and administrators. The author then reviewed the literature on trust in order to develop a strategy to deal explicitly with building trust in the school system.

Taylor (1989) summarized the importance of trust in labor-management relations. He found that "trust is extraordinarily ubiquitous, influencing the very nature of the enterprise, from communications to the willingness of people to associate with each other and to work together. . . . it effects the resources available to the enterprise, especially the availability of timely and accurate information. . . . trust facilitates cooperation . . . and it has major positive effects on the ability of the firm to respond to its environment . . ." (p. 87). Taylor noted that trust develops over time in an atmosphere of openness and an environment that is consistent, reliable and predictable.

DeBruyn (1976) pointed out that "Trust is a necessary ingredient for teacher and administrator alike. Without doubt, trust must be on both sides, or the potential of both teacher and leader is diminished and may be rendered ineffective" (p. 114).

Hoy and Kupersmith (1984) studied leader authenticity and trust in the school setting. They defined trust as "A generalized expectancy held by the work group that the word, promise, and written or oral statement of another individual, group, or organization can be relied upon" (p. 82). Their study sought to demonstrate the interrelationship between three dimensions of trust: (a) faculty trust in the principal, (b) faculty trust in colleagues, and (c) faculty trust in the school organization. They found that all three dimensions were significantly related.

In a study of 150 Kansas teachers, Lyman (1987) identified seven factors that enhance or inhibit trust as related to supervision/evaluation of teachers: orientation to the evaluation process, positive tone, concern, time, positive feedback, listening skills, and support. In addition, he proposed a plan for a staff development program to improve trust. His plan served as a foundation for the present study.

Backgroud/Setting

The Harwich Public Schools consist of three schools each with a principal and assistant principal, and there is a director of pupil personnel services who, assisted by the building administrators, supervises the special education and counseling staffs.

In the 1990-1991 school year, when the problem this study addresses was identified, there were 107 teachers in Harwich supervised by seven administrators; in the 1991-1992 school year, the year the intervention plan to deal with the problem was implemented, there were 109 teachers and seven administrators; in the 1992-1993 school year, the completion year for this study, there were 110 teachers and seven administrators.

During the 1992-1993 school year one of the administrators who was an original participant in this study was transfered to a different position and a new administrator was hired as a replacement.

Methods and techniques

This study, an action research project, consisted of (a) a staff development process to devise a questionnaire to rate administrator behaviors which enhance or inhibit trust, (b) the development and implementation of trust building plans over a 12 month period, and (c) the assessment of the results of the trust building plans through readministration of the questionnaire developed in step "a".

1991-1992 School Year

Introductory Activities

Prior to the official implementation date of this project, October 1, 1991, a "Trust Building Program" (see Appendix A) was developed through discussions at several meetings with the administrators during the second half of the 1990-1991 school year.

Questionnaire Design

In early October 1991, faculty members from all three schools in the district met with the author to discuss the importance of trust in teacher-administrator relations and to identify factors that enhance or inhibit trust. At faculty meetings (forums) in each of the three schools in the district, staff members, working in groups of three to eight, were given the following directions: "Think about all of the supervisors you have had from your student-teaching experiences to the present and list . . . those supervisor behaviors that have (a) contributed to your professional growth, (b) enhanced your trust in the supervisor, (c) caused you worry and concern, and (d) reduced your trust in the supervisor."

The collation of the lists of behaviors generated at the forums resulted in the identification of 117 behaviors: 74 enhancers and 43 inhibitors. (The differences in the lists generated in each school were largely semantic. The staffs of all three schools identified similar behaviors although they expressed them in ways the behaviors may be played out in their school.) In late October, the author met separately with faculty advisory councils in each school. All three councils were asked to discuss and identify the enhancers and inhibitors they felt were best representative of behaviors related to trust and which, therefore, should be included on a questionnaire. All three councils identified the same 13 enhancers and 3 inhibitors (Group A). Two out of the three councils identified the same 24 enhancers and 5 inhibitors (Group B). Each group separately

identified 25 enhancers and 18 inhibitors (Group C). Using the enhancers and inhibitors from Groups A and B, the author prepared a draft of a questionnaire, which included 41 different behaviors stated positively. This questionnaire and the groups of behaviors identified by the faculty advisory councils were reviewed with the administrators.

Following the review by the administrators, the author prepared a second draft of the questionnaire listing 30 behaviors. Following a review of that draft by the administrators, the author made clarifying changes in the rating scale and presented the questionnaire to the faculty advisory councils in November. This step in the implementation process was to be a pretest of the questionnaire. However, because the teachers on the councils would then complete the questionnaire twice, the author felt that their completing the questionnaire as a pretest might prejudice the results. Also, the author wanted council members to judge each question and the rating scale for its validity to them as an appropriate measure of trust and have the opportunity to discuss that with their colleagues and come to a consensus. This process was tantamount to a juried review of the questionnaire.

The 30 behaviors on the questionnaire, now called the Administrator Rating Form (see Appendix B), consisted of three categories: Items 1-12 indicated personal behaviors related to authenticity, a term used by Hoy and Kupersmith (1984); Items 13-22 indicated general professional behaviors; and Items 23-30 indicated behaviors related to supervision/evaluation.

Administration of the Administrator Rating Form: December 1991

In December 1991, at faculty forums in each school, staff members were asked to complete at least two rating forms, one for their assigned evaluator and one for the other administrator in the building. If teachers were assigned to more than one building, they were asked to rate their assigned evaluator and one other administrator with whom they worked. Educators working in pupil personnel services (e.g., special education teachers and counselors) were asked to rate the Director of Pupil Personnel Services and one building administrator for whom they worked. All educators could, however, choose to rate all the administrators with whom they worked.

There were 249 rating forms completed by 113 staff members.

Results of Administrator Ratings: December 1991

The author tabulated the scores (the number of 5s, 4s, etc.) on each item for each administrator. Average scores for each item were calculated, modes for each item were determined, and items on which less than 80% of the staff ranking the items responded were identified. Additionally identified on the rating form were the items for which the administrator received an average score of less than 3.50. An average score of 3.50 was chosen as the minimum acceptable level of recognition by the administrators rather than the mid-point of the rating scale, 3.00.

The author then tabulated and computed the scores for the administrators as a group (team).

Table 1 indicates the group results of the administrator ratings. Results, which were translated into trust building goals for the administrative team are identified with an asterisk.

For the administrative team, the highest average score (4.30), indicating administrators engaged in the behavior often, was on Item #16, "Gives criticism in private." The lowest average score (3.02), indicating administrators sometimes engaged in the behavior, was on Item #23, "Spends time in classrooms." No average scores indicated that the administrators as a group "seldom" or "almost never" exhibited a behavior listed on the rating form.

For individual administrators, only 4 average scores out of the 210 possible (7 administrators rated on 30 items each) were below 3.00. Three administrators scored below 3.00 on Item #23, "Spends time in the classrooms," and one of these administrators also scored below 3.00 on Item #21, "Actively participates in the school community." (Results for individual administrators are summarized in Table 2.)

Development of Trust Building Plans

The administrative team identified the following goals: to improve the level of trust between teachers and administrators as measured by the Administrator Rating Form (ARF) and to increase the number of teachers who knew them well enough to rate them on the ARF (i.e., not to indicate NB). The four objectives identified, based on the scores that are asterisked in the results in Table 1, were:

Table 1

Administrator Rating Form: Summary of Group Results (12/91)

At or above 3.50 average

ALL administrators scored at or above 3.50 on 14 items
(2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 16, 19, 24, 25, 27, 29)

6/7 administrators scored at or above 3.50 on 10 items
(1, 3, 10, 11, 15, 17, 20, 21, 22, 26)

5/7 administrators scored at or above 3.50 on 2 items
(18, 30)*

4/7 administrators scored at or above 3.50 on 3 items
(6, 12, 28)*

NO administrators scored at or above 3.50 on 1 item
(23)*

Items with Mode of NB

5/7 administrators received a mode of NB on item 10

3/7 administrators received a mode of NB on item 29*

2/7 administrators received a mode of NB on each of items 16 & 28*

1/7 administrators received a mode of NB on each of items 6, 22, & 25*

Notes. Scores are based upon ranking items on a Likert scale from a high of 5 to a low of 1. *Items translated into trust building goals.

Table 2

Administrator Rating Form: Summary of Individual Results (12/91)

Admin.	# of educator's rating	# (%) of items with Scores below 3.50	# of items with modes of 5	4	3	2	1	NB	Mean across items
A	23	14 (47)	3	18	15	0	0	7	3.45
B	29	3 (10)	21	7	1	1	0	3	4.04
C	31	1 (3)	17	11	1	0	0	1	4.14
D	32	2 (6)	15	13	4	0	0	2	3.89
E	40	4 (13)	14	8	8	1	0	3	4.09
F	46	1 (3)	15	11	1	0	0	5	4.11
G	48	5 (17)	10	18	5	0	0	0	3.84

Notes. n = 30. NB = "No Basis for Judgment". Scores are based upon ranking items on a Likert scale from 5 (high) to 1 (low).

1. As compared to the results on the ARF administered in December 1991, the average scores for all administrators on Items 6, 12, 18, 23, 28, and 30 on the March 1993 administration of the ARF will be at least 3.50.

2. As compared to the result on the ARF administered in December 1991, the number of items with an average score of 3.50 for all administrators on the March 1993 administration of the ARF will increase from 14 to 20.

3. On the March 1993 administration of the ARF, no administrators will obtain a mode of NB on Items 25, 28, or 29.

4. As compared to the results on the ARF administrated in December 1991, the number of items on which all administrators receive a mode of 4 or 5 on the March 1993 administration of the ARF will increase by 100% from 6 to 12.

Using the two goals of the team as individual goals, each administrator then identified his or her own objectives based upon the items on which he/she received an average score below 3.5 or a mode of NB. For example, all administrators have the following objective for Goal #1 after filling in the blank with their own score. "My average score on Item #23 on the Administrator Rating Form will increase from _____ on the December 1991 administration to at least 3.50 on the March 1993 administration." In order to accomplish Goal #2, an administrator may use the following phrase. "On the March 1993 administration of the Administrator Rating Form, I will not obtain a mode of NB on item _____."

Administrator A identified nine objectives in his personal trust building plan; Administrators D, E, and G identified five objectives; Administrator F identified four; Administrator B identified two; and Administrator C identified one.

Because all administrators received an average score of less than 3.50 on Item #23, "Spends time in classrooms," all administrators included an objective in their personal trust building plans to address that item. Four administrators included an objective to address Item #28, "Provides support for improving weaknesses"; three included objectives to address Items #6, "Treats all persons impartially" and #12 "Is willing to admit mistakes"; two included objectives to address Items #25,

"Encourages risk taking and innovation" and #30, "Gathers sufficient information before drawing conclusions."

After articulating their own goals and objectives, administrators developed strategies or activities for each objective. The objectives and the strategies were developed by the building administrators (principals and assistants) after consultation with the author, with each other, and with their faculty advisory councils.

The Director of Pupil Personnel Services, after discussing his scores with the author, developed his own unique program for developing a trust building plan. He met with individual staff members and went over his ratings on the rating form and asked their help first in validating and clarifying the scores, and then in assisting him to develop a plan.

Implementation of Trust Building Plans

The implementation of trust building plans began in early spring of 1992 (1991-1992 school year) and continued through the 1992-1993 school year. (Examples of objectives and activities formulated by the administrators and their staffs and contained in trust building plans are included in Appendix C.)

1992-1993 School Year

In December 1992, the author met individually with the administrators to review their progress on trust building. The administrators said they were more conscious of their behaviors related to building trust, and they acted accordingly to enhance rather than inhibit development of trust.

Administration of the Administrator Rating Form: March 1993

In March 1993, as in December 1991, at faculty forums in each school, staff members were asked to complete at least two rating forms, one for their assigned evaluator and one for the other administrator in the building. If teachers were assigned to more than one building, they were asked to rate their assigned evaluator and one other administrator with whom they worked. Educators working in pupil personnel services (e.g., special education teachers and counselors) were asked to rate the Director of Pupil Personnel Services and one building administrator for whom they worked. All educators could, however, choose to rate all the administrators with whom they worked.

There were 188 rating forms completed by 107 staff members.

Results of Administrator Ratings: March 1993

The Administrator Rating Forms were scored in the same manner as the December 1991 forms were scored. Average scores for each item were calculated, modes for each item were determined, and items to which less than 80% of the staff ranking the items on that administrator responded were identified. Additionally identified on the rating form were the items for which the administrator received an average score less than 3.50.

The author then tabulated and computed the scores for the administrators as a group. In preparing the average score results, the author determined average scores on the three categories of behaviors as well as the average score for all items labeling those categories "authenticity"--Items 1-12, "professional"--Items 13-22, and "supervisory"--Items 23-30. This

way of displaying the results of the questionnaire proved to be the most useful for the administrative team.

Because one of the administrators had changed jobs and therefore was not included in the March 1993 rating (thus six rather than seven administrators' scores contributed to the group results), the administrator's scores were eliminated from the December 1991 results so that the pre- and posttest results on the questionnaire could be compared.

Table 3 contains the summary of the March 1993 questionnaire results. Table 4 is a revision of Table 1 (summary of the December 1991 questionnaire results) excluding Administrator D. The results in Table 3 can then be compared with validity with the results in Table 4 because they include the scores of the same six administrators.

The focus of the discussion of the March 1993 questionnaire results was on whether or not the goals and objectives identified from the results of the December 1991 questionnaire were met.

The goals the administrative team identified were to improve the level of trust between teachers and administrators as measured by the Administrator Rating Form (ARF) and to increase the number of teachers who knew them well enough to rate them on the Administrator Rating Form (i.e., not to indicate "No Basis for Judgment").

As indicated in Table 5, both of these goals were met. The total average score for 1993 at 3.94 was 0.03 points higher than the total average score" in 1991 at 3.91. Not a great increase, but an increase nonetheless. However, the

Table 3

Administrator Rating Form: Summary of Group Results (3/93)

At or Above 3.50 Average

ALL 6 Administrators scored at or above 3.50 on 8 items

(14, 16, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29)

5/6 Administrators scored at or above 3.50 on 14 items

(1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 19, 20, 22, 26, 28)

4/6 Administrators scored at or above 3.50 on 7 items

(3, 6, 7, 12, 17, 18, 30)

2/6 Administrators scored at or above 3.50 on 1 item

(23)

Items with Mode of NB

3/6 Administrators received a mode of NB on item 22

1/6 Administrators received a mode of NB on each of items 16, & 21

Notes. Scores are based upon ranking items on a Likert scale from a high of 5 to a low of 1.

NB scores show a more positive change with 5 items having a mode of NB in 1993 as compared to 13 items in 1991.

From the December 1991 questionnaire results as indicated in Table 1, the items for which two or more administrators received an average score below 3.50 were selected as areas for

Table 4

Administrator Rating Form: Summary of Group Results (12/91): Without Administrator D

At or above 3.50 average

ALL 6 Administrators scored at or above 3.50 on 14 items

(2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 16, 19, 24, 25, 27, 29)

5/6 Administrators scored at or above 3.50 on 10 items

(1, 3, 10, 11, 15, 17, 20, 21, 22, 26)

4/6 Administrators scored at or above 3.50 on 3 items
(18, 28, 30)*

3/6 Administrators scored at or above 3.50 on 2 items
(6, 12)*

NO Administrators scored at or above 3.50 on 1 item
(23)*

Items with mode of NB

5/6 Administrators received a mode of NB on item 10

2/6 Administrators received a score of NB on each of items 28*, & 29*

1/6 Administrators received a score of NB on each of items 6, 16, 22, & 25*

Notes. Scores are based upon ranking items on a Likert scale from a high of 5 to a low of 1. *Items translated into trust building goals.

Table 5

Administrative Team Results: Comparisons

	Modes					
	Number of items with modes of					
Year	5	4	3	2	1	NB
1993	98	53	27	1	3	5
1991	73	74	38	4	1	13
Difference	25	-21	-9	-3	2	-8

	Average scores by category of items (Item numbers)			
	Authenticity	Professional	Supervisory	Total
Year	1 - 12	13 - 22	23 - 30	1 - 30
1993	3.93	4.00	3.90	3.94
1991	3.91	3.97	3.86	3.91
Difference	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.03

improvement. In addition, the administrative team selected those supervisory trust items (numbers 23 through 30) for which any administrator received a mode of NB as an item to improve upon.

The four objectives stated below were formulated from the areas selected for improvement. An analysis of the results follows each statement. (Administrator G experienced a personnel problem in the winter of the 1992-1993 school year which had a dramatic negative effect on his results on the March 1993 ARF and, consequently, the overall results for the administrative team. Administrator G left the school system at the end of the school year.)

1. The average scores for all administrators on Items 6, 12, 18, 23, 28, and 30 on the March 1993 administration of the ARF will be at least 3.50.

This objective was not met. Only two administrators had average scores at or above 3.50 on Item 23; four administrators had average scores at or above 3.50 on Items 6, 12, 18, and 30; five administrators had average scores at or above 3.50 on Item 28.

2. The number of items with an average score of 3.50 for all administrators will increase from 14 in December 1991 to 20 in March 1993.

This objective was not met. There were only eight items for which all six administrators scored at or above 3.50.

3. On the March 1993 administration of the ARF, no administrators will obtain a mode of NB on Items 25, 28, or 29.

This objective was achieved.

4. The number of items on which all administrators receive a mode of 4 or 5 will double from 6 in December 1991 to 12 in March 1993.

This objective was not achieved.

In spite of the results on the specific objectives set, the following comparison of the group results on the Administrator Rating Forms listed in Tables 3 and 4 indicates improvements in trust for the team and for individual administrators. The objective of the project was achieved--the level of trust between teachers and administrators increased.

1. In 1993, 29 items received average scores at or above 3.50 by four out of six administrators as compared to 27 items in 1991.

2. In 1993, on Item 23, "Spends time in classrooms," two administrators received average scores above 3.50 as compared to no administrators scoring at or above 3.50 in 1991.

3. In 1993, there were modes of NB on only three items as compared to seven items in 1991.

Of most importance to this author was how the level of trust improved for individual administrators as a result of their own trust building programs and their sensitivity to the issue of trust. Results for individual administrators are presented in Table 6 as they were in Table 2 (except that scores for Administrator D are omitted). A comparison of Tables 2 and 6 indicates that the modes recorded for the items shifted from NB toward 5; most of the modes for all administrators except Administrator G are 4s and 5s. The number of items on the questionnaire for which administrators' received average scores below 3.50 decreased for three administrators (for one

dramatically), stayed the same for one, and decreased for two (for one dramatically).

From the results of the December 1991 scores on the Administrator Rating Forms, each administrator formulated a trust building plan focusing on improving his/her scores on specific items on the Administrator Rating Form. All administrators included an objective to address the team goal of spending more time in the classrooms (Item 23). As mentioned previously, only two administrators met the objective of getting a score of 3.50 or better on item 23.

Overall, the results relative to specific objectives in the individual administrators' trust building plans were mixed. Administrator C had only one objective, to increase his score on Item 23 from below 3.50 to above 3.50; he achieved his goal. Two administrators failed to meet their objectives completely; the scores for all five objectives of Administrator G decreased; whereas of the scores for Administrator E, one increased, two decreased, and two remained the same. Administrator B achieved one of his two objectives. For the objective not achieved, the score was above 3.50 but did not reach the target of 3.75 set by the administrator. Administrator F's focus was on reducing the number of NBs. Three of the four goals for this administrator dealt with this factor, and all were achieved (the administrator received a mode of 4 on each of the items). The remaining objective related to Item 23 on the ARF was not achieved. Only three of the five objectives for Administrator A were achieved even though in all cases the scores on the items increased.

Table 6

Administrator Rating Form: Summary of Individual Results (3/93)

Admin.	# of Educator's Rating	#(%) of items with Scores Below 3.50	# of items with Modes of 5	4	3	2	1	NB	Mean across Items
A	20	2(7)	12	12	7	0	0	2	3.91
B	27	0	24	7	0	0	0	0	4.38
C	27	0	29	1	0	0	0	0	4.38
E	35	6(20)	11	15	5	0	0	0	3.80
F	34	1(3)	16	12	1	0	0	2	4.13
G	45	22(73)	6	6	14	1	3	1	3.19

Notes. n = 30. NB = "No Basis for Judgment". Scores are based upon ranking items on a Likert scale from a high of 5 to a low of 1.

Comparatively speaking, Administrator A made the greatest progress.

Summary and Discussion

This action research project began in the spring of 1991 after the Harwich Public Schools administrative team reviewed the results of a survey regarding why teachers in our schools had not chosen an optional goal-setting mode of evaluation. A reason identified by the teachers was a lack of trust between teachers and administrators. The author shared the work of Lyman (1987)

with the administrative team and together we embarked on a trust building program.

The project was successful. There was an improvement in trust as indicated in the results of questionnaires administered to teachers before and after the implementation of trust building plans. Most of all, the level of consciousness of the importance of trust was raised in staff members. From the initial discussion of the issue of trust by the administrators in the spring of 1991 and subsequent discussion with the staff as a whole in the fall of 1991, trust became a word frequently used in conversation about relationships between and among teachers and administrators. The awareness of the importance of trust in the working relationships of the staff led to behaviors that fostered trust and led to the identification of problems resulting from the lack of trust.

The most intensive period of staff involvement in this project was during the preparation of the questionnaire, the Administrator Rating Form. The forums held to discuss trust and then to have teachers work in small groups to generate lists of supervisor behaviors that enhance or inhibit trust were, as staff members noted, professionally stimulating and productive. The faculty seemed to enjoy the discussions, approached the tasks purposefully, and produced a wealth of ideas. The sharing period at the end of each session, where each small group presented examples of enhancers and inhibitors was enlightening. A sense of collegiality existed in those meetings, which carried forward into a series of meetings with the faculty advisory councils at which the time-consuming task of preparing questionnaire items by

reducing a list of 117 behaviors to 30 was accomplished. Several hours were spent on this phase of the project with the result that the staff members felt ownership of the questionnaire. For the author, the opportunities to work closely with groups of teachers in each building was a professionally rewarding experience. It gave him an opportunity to express and share ideas, to listen and to validate the ideas and opinions of the teachers present, and to foster a sense of collegiality--in short, to build trust.

In spite of the unfortunate events surrounding Administrator G, the Harwich administrators felt that the trust building effort was a success. The author accomplished what he set out to do, to improve the level of trust between teachers and administrators and to increase the involvement of teachers in the goal-setting mode of evaluation. (A secondary objective of this project was to increase the number of teachers participating in an optional goal-setting mode of evaluation. In 1990-1991, only one (0.7%) of the 107 teachers participated in the goal-setting mode, the fact that prompted this study. In 1991-1992, 40 (36.7%) of 109 teachers particpated, and in 1992-1993, 21 (19%) of 110 teachers participated.)

The author and the administrators have learned that to build personal trust, or authenticity, an administrator must (a) be a good listener, (b) maintain confidentiality, (c) react calmly in a crisis, (d) show personal concern for teachers, (e) be approachable as a person, (f) treat all persons impartially, (g) be flexible, (h) have a sense of humor, (i) have a pleasant manner, (j) be aware of his/her own strengths and weaknesses, (k)

be consistent in his/her behavior, and (l) be willing to admit mistakes.

To build professional trust, an administrator must (a) treat teachers as colleagues, (b) provide support with respect to parent complaints, (c) give praise for achievements, (d) give criticism in private, (e) share decision making with teachers, (f) communicate clear expectations, (g) take action on serious concerns of teachers, (h) consistently enforce school policies, (i) actively participate in the school community, and (j) give priority to educational matters before political matters.

To build trust as a supervisor, an administrator must (a) spend time in classrooms, (b) give teachers autonomy to make professional decisions, (c) encourage risk taking and innovation, (d) give constructive feedback, (e) respect different teaching styles, (f) provide support for improving weaknesses, (g) encourage opportunities for professional growth, and (h) gather sufficient information before drawing a conclusion.

Implications and Recommendations

The author has demonstrated that the level of trust between teachers and administrators can be improved through a proactive process. By making the building of trust an explicit goal of a school or school system, administrators and teachers can increase their level of consciousness about trust and thereby focus on behaviors that are trust enhancing rather than trust inhibiting.

The rewards of the trust building process for the Harwich administrators were clear--improved trust, improved school climate, improved supervision/evaluation, and improved staff

development. All of these areas are related to the development of the human resources in our schools, which are essential to the success of our schools.

The author recommends that this action research project be replicated in schools and school systems throughout the country. From the author's experience, that effort will result in creating an awareness of the importance of trust and those behaviors that enhance and inhibit its development. A strength of this project was identification of administrator behaviors that enhance and inhibit the development of trust. Others who develop a trust building program similar to the one in this project will identify their own list of enhancers and inhibitors. The list will be similar to the list we compiled in Harwich but worded differently to reflect the culture of the school or school system in question. Personal, professional, and supervisory behaviors, however, will be identified. During that process of identification, trusting behaviors will be reaffirmed, and behaviors, which lead to mistrust, will be identified. It will be critical to the development of positive relationships to deal with the mistrusting behaviors, and, it must not be forgotten, building trust will take time. From this author's perspective, it will be time well spent.

References

DeBruyn, R.L. (1976). Causing others to want your leadership. Manhattan, KS: Harper & Row.

Hoy, W.K. & Kupersmith, W. (1984). Principal authenticity and faculty trust: Key elements in organizational behavior. Planning & Changing, 15 (2), 80-88.

Lyman, L. (1987, March). Principals and teachers: collaboration to improve instructional supervision (building trust, fostering collaboration, encouraging collegiality). Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, New Orleans.

Taylor, R.G., Jr. (1989). The role of trust in labor-management relations. Organization Development Journal, 7 (2), 85-89.

Appendixes

Appendix A

We believe that each child is unique, with different abilities, needs, and potentials. The mission of the Harwich Public Schools is to provide an educational environment and programs (1) in which the uniqueness of each child is recognized, (2) in which each child is helped to develop his/her intellectual, creative, and physical capabilities to the fullest, and (3) in which each child learns how to live cooperatively and effectively with others.

HARWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Administration Offices
Oak Street
Harwich, MA 02645
Charles H. Ferris, Jr., Superintendent
(508) 432-0244

TRUST BUILDING PROGAM
8/91 - 5/93

I. Introductory Activities

8/26/91	Step A	Preschool meetings with administrators, Review
	Sup't.*	a. new procedures for goal setting
		b. plan for trust building
9/3/91	Step B	1. Orientation Day for Teachers
		a. review procedures for the new goal setting
	Sup't.	mode of evaluation
		b. introduce the trust building program.
	Principals	2. School staff meetings
		a. explain the procedures for the goal-setting mode of evaluation and
		b. implement the process.

***Indicates responsible party**

II. Implementation Activities

A. Questionnaire Design

10/91 Step 1 — Faculty Forums

Sup't. — Following a brief description of the goals of the meeting, all present will be organized into heterogeneous groups of 3 or 4. Each group will be asked to list supervisor behaviors and practices that (1a) have contributed to their professional growth and (1b) have enhanced their trust in the supervisor, and (2a) have caused them worry and concern and (2b) have reduced their trust in the supervisor. Participants will be encouraged to think of all of the supervisors they have had from their student-teaching experiences to the present. After a 20-30-minute period the faculty will reconvene as a whole and each group will share their top two responses. The rest of the trust building program (described below) will be shared with the faculty before adjourning the meeting.

Step 2

Sup't. — Collate the responses from the faculty of the three schools and prepare a master list of both positive and negative responses.

10/91 Step 3

Sup't. — Faculty Advisory Council (last week) at each school - identify, by consensus, the 10-15 most important behaviors or practices for a supervisor to utilize or avoid.

	Step 4	Collate the responses from the three schools and prepare one list of the 10-15
	Sup't.	most frequently listed behaviors or practices. A questionnaire draft will be prepared listing each item with a Likert scale by each.
11/91	Step 5	1. Adminitrators' Meeting review draft of the questionnaire
	Sup't.	2. Faculty Advisory Councils administer the questionnaire as a pretest before it is finalized

B. Administration of Questionnaire

12/91	Step 6	Faculty meeting in each school- administer
	Sup't.	questionnaire. Each staff member will be
	H.S. 12/10	asked to anonymously rank his/her current
	M.S. 12/12	supervisor on each of the items on the
	E.S. 12/10	questionnaire.
1/92	Step 7	Collate the results of the ratings and share them with the administrators from each
	Sup't.	school individually and with the Administrative Team as a whole.
		a. Areas for development common to
	1/7	all supervisors will be identified by the Administrative Team.
	Goal Review Conferences	b. Personal areas for development will be identified by individual administrators.
	1/27	c. Administrative Cluster Meeting workshop on trust building activities

C. Development of Trust Building Plans

2/92	Step 8 **Administrators**	1. The administrators from each school share individual and common areas for development with Faculty Advisory Council.* Together, administrators and members of the Faculty Advisory Council prepare a trust building plan that incorporates the common and individual areas for development. 2. The administrators and Faculty Advisory Council share the trust building plan with the staff.

* Director of P.P.S. meet with staff (or a representative group) in the same way as the school administrators meet with advisory councils.

D. Implementation of Trust Building Plans

3/92	Step 9 **Sup't.** **Administrators**	1. Implement Trust Building Plans a. The Administrative Team* members serve as resources and support for each other during this process of development b. The Faculty Advisory Council* serve as a support group and resource for the administrators in the school *meet monthly 2. Administrative Cluster Meetingg: 3/30 Share Trust Building Plans
8/92	Step 10	Preschool meeting wiht administrators a. Review Trust Building Plans b. Review Teacher Evaluation Process

10/92	Step 11	Administrative Cluster Meeting Progress Report - Trust Building Plans

E. Readministration of Questionnaire and Assessment of Results

3/93	Step 12	1. Readminister questionnaire administered in Step #6**
	Sup't.	2. Tabulate & share results

** In order to maintain validity in the results of the second questionnaire, educators will be assigned the same supervisors for the 1991-92 and 1992-93 school years.

4/93	Step 13	1. Administrators' Cluster Meeting
	Sup't.	a. Share results
		b. Assess results for further planning
	Admin.	2. Faculty Advisory Council Meetings
		a. Share results
		b. Assess results for further planning
5/93	Step 14	Faculty Meetings
		a. Share results of questionnaire
	Admin. & FAC's	b. Share plans for continued development

Appendix B

December 1991

ADMINISTRATOR RATING FORM

The following behaviors of administrators have been identified by Harwich teachers as related to the development of trust between administrators and teachers. Please rate your building administrators on these behaviors, completing a separate rating form for each of the building administrators with whom you are working this year. If you work in more than one building, you may rank only one administrator per building. Also, if you are a member of the pupil personnel services department, please complete a rating form for the Director of Pupil Personnel Services.

Name of Administrator_____ Assigned Evaluator for '91-'92?
Yes_____ No_____

Evaluation mode you are in this year: Goal-Setting_____ OR Summative_____

Number of years you have been in the school system (including this year):
0-3_____; 4-12_____; 13-19_____; 20^{+}_____

Number of years you have worked with the administrator you are rating on this form (including this year): 0-3_____; 4-12_____; 13-19_____; 20^{+}_____

Circle only one choice for each statement below which indicates how often the administrator you are rating exhibits the behaviors listed.

aA=Almost Always	O=Often	Sm=Sometimes	S=Seldom	aN=Never	or NB=No Basis for Judgment
5	4	3	2	1	

	aA	O	Sm	S	aN	
1. Is a good listener	5	4	3	2	1	NB
2. Maintains confidentiality	5	4	3	2	1	NB
3. Reacts calmly in a crisis	5	4	3	2	1	NB
4. Shows personal concern for teachers	5	4	3	2	1	NB
5. Is approachable as a person	5	4	3	2	1	NB
6. Treats all persons impartially	5	4	3	2	1	NB
7. Is flexible	5	4	3	2	1	NB

OVER

	aA	O	Sm	S	aN	
8. Has a sense of humor	5	4	3	2	1	NB
9. Has a pleasant manner	5	4	3	2	1	NB
10. Is aware of own strengths and weaknesses	5	4	3	2	1	NB
11. Is consistent in his/her behavior	5	4	3	2	1	NB
12. Is willing to admit mistakes	5	4	3	2	1	NB
13. Treats teachers as colleagues	5	4	3	2	1	NB
14. Provides support with respect to parent complaints	5	4	3	2	1	NB
15. Gives praise for achievements	5	4	3	2	1	NB
16. Gives criticism in private	5	4	3	2	1	NB
17. Shares decision making with teachers	5	4	3	2	1	NB
18. Communicates clear expectations	5	4	3	2	1	NB
19. Takes action on serious concerns of teachers	5	4	3	2	1	NB
20. Consistently enforces school policies	5	4	3	2	1	NB
21. Actively participates in the school community	5	4	3	2	1	NB
22. Gives priority to educational matters before political matters	5	4	3	2	1	NB
23. Spends time in the classrooms	5	4	3	2	1	NB
24. Gives teachers autonomy to make professional decisions	5	4	3	2	1	NB
25. Encourages risk taking and innovation	5	4	3	2	1	NB
26. Gives constructive feedback	5	4	3	2	1	NB
27. Respects different teaching styles	5	4	3	2	1	NB
28. Provides support for improving weaknesses	5	4	3	2	1	NB
29. Encourages opportunities for professional growth	5	4	3	2	1	NB
30. Gathers sufficient information before drawing a conclusion	5	4	3	2	1	NB

Appendix C

Trust Building Plans: Objectives & Activities

The following are examples of objectives and activities formulated by the administrators and their staffs and contained in trust building plans.

1. Objective: Provide clear-cut expectations.

Insure that I have requested the right persons to do the job and that the expectations fit their roles and responsibilities.

2. Objective: Provide staff support for parental complaints.

Whenever possible talk to staff about "issues" after the parents have left and after having gathered all information from all relevant staff and administrators.

3. Objective: Continue to work on "quick" decisions.

Gather all information first.

4. Objective: Improve score on Item #1 of the ARF, "Is a good listener" and Item #4, "Shows personal concerns for teachers."

Meet with each staff member once every 8 weeks for 15-30 minutes to listen to personal and professional staff concerns.

5. Objective: Improve score on Item #16 of the ARF, "Gives criticism in private."

When teachers catch me on the run, move the discussion when possible to a private or closed door situation to promote confidentiality.

6. Objective: Improve score on Item #20 of the ARF, "Consistently enforces school policies."

Send teachers a copy of the action taken in all infractions of school policy and, in most cases, what will happen in a subsequent offense.

7. Objective: Improve score on Item #23 of the ARF, "Spends time in classrooms."

Ask teachers to invite me into their classrooms when they have something special they want me to see.

Short-term classroom visitations will be increased. These are apart from the teacher evaluation visits.

I will increase my in-class time by spending more time in classrooms observing teacher and student behavior by making at least two planned observations each week through 1993.

8. Objective: Improve score on Item #28 of the ARF, "Provides support for improving weaknesses."

When discussing problems with teachers I supervise, I will ask "what do you need to make this work?" and seek any additional resources they need to be more successful in problem solving in the classroom.

9. Objective: Improve score on Item #25 on the ARF, "Encourages risk taking and innovation."

As a part of the evaluation conference, I will emphasize the need for risk taking and innovation.

I will acknowledge personal risk taking by teachers at faculty meetings.

10. Objectives: Improve score on Item #6 on the ARF, "Treats all persons impartially"

Examine schedule and assignments to insure that, to the extent possible, they are equitable--make adjustments as necessary.

Respond equitably, fairly, and consistently to all staff.

11. Objective: Improve score on Item #17 on the ARF, "Shares decision-making with teachers."

Continue the faculty advisory council (FAC) process of presenting issues to the FAC for review and input prior to making a decision.

12. Objective: Improve score on Item #7 on the ARF, "Is flexible."

Reflect on all aspects of issues and problems before making decisions, all of which are in the best interest of the school.

13. Objective: Improve score on Item #29 of the ARF, "Encourages opportunities for professional growth."

I will focus on offering specifics for professional growth during follow-up conferences with my assigned staff.

14. Objective: Improve score on Item #30 of the ARF, "Gathers sufficient information before drawing a conclusion."

I will continue my work to encourage teachers to have input into school curriculum and management issues.

Greater efforts will be made to solicit [input] from all parties.